

ECFS - E-mail Filing
<PROCEEDING>RM-10352
<DATE>02/06/02
<NAME>Walls Robert A.
<ADDRESS1>36 Howard Drive
<ADDRESS2>None
<CITY>Artesia
<STATE>NM
<ZIP>88210-9231
<LAW-FIRM>None
<ATTORNEY>None
<FILE-NUMBER>None
<DOCUMENT-TYPE>CO
<PHONE-NUMBER>505-365-2208
<DESCRIPTION>Comments about LEGAL separation of wideband and narrowband modes on 160 Meter Ham Band
<CONTACT-EMAIL>ke5yd@pvtnetworks.net
<TEXT>I believe that our Fore Fathers did a Superb job in putting together our Constitution and Bill of Rights. I believe that THEY were thinking of "the Greater Good for the Greater Number" when doing so.

I also believe that there have been instances in which these documents (or portions thereof) have been taken into Court by a Minority group, Argued before the Court, and a Judgement ruled such that their VOICE is as strong as or stronger than that of the Majority. I'm not sure that our Fore Fathers would approve of using these documents and the Courts in this manner?

I have operated the 160 meter band DAILY for the past 17 years. Most of this operation was in a Ragchew manner on SSB above 1.843 megahertz. I have also contested a little and pursued some DX. 160 Meters is NOT a congested band; EXCEPT during contests! It is NOT a band for ALL hams due to the antenna requirements. In years past, I have worked ZL's, VK's, ZS's and some others on SSB phone below 1.833 mhz. I am aware of the phone group that operated at 1.822 mhz for many many years. 160 Meters used to be a small restricted low power band. For many years now, it has been an OPEN band as to mixing of wide and narrow band modes. I have seen NO REAL Problems due to this mixing.

I'm not sure how far back "The Gentleman's Band" connotation goes? I've always thought that this connotation had to do with "getting along" with the fellow ham and the "self policing" of the band.

I do not agree with the ARRL VOLUNTARY bandplan or this proposal. First, I do not feel like a band plan was needed! If needed, then I think the lower phone limit was set too HIGH.

It seems to me that a ruling in favor of this proposal would GO AGAINST the things

that the World, the ARRL, and the FCC have seemed to be advocating? The World...

little or NO code requirement; the Arrl...lower or no code requirement so as to entice more people to become Hams; the FCC...advocates of a self-policing ham population. Since it appears that WE are working toward a NO-CODE requirement, why reserve More spectrum to it? When one adds All these things up, and it's NOT

broke to start with; then let's NOT fix it with more restrictions to enforce?

Thanks for hearing my comment!

R. A. Walls KE5YD

